

ZAMBEZIA

A Journal of Social Studies in Southern and Central Africa

Volume 1, No. 2

January, 1970

Edited by

R. S. Roberts

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF RHODESIA
SALISBURY

A Village School and Community Development in a Rhodesian Tribal Trust Land

M. W. Murphree

*Department of Sociology, University College of Rhodesia,
Salisbury.*

SCOPE AND AIMS.

This article presents and analyses a case history collected from one community in a Rhodesian tribal trust land, with special reference to the village school as a factor in social change.¹ In particular it deals with those aspects of social change which find prominence in contemporary schemes of community development. These include, among other things, such items as the local realignment of power, authority and influence, the reorientation of values, aspirations and expectations, and the training of individuals for the new roles that these changes produce.

When we speak of such things as value orientation and role preparation in an educational context we naturally think of the students who are the objects of formal education in a school. It is not, however, upon the students but upon the parents of the village school that this paper is focused, not upon the formal, deliberate attempts of the school to impart techniques, concepts and values to students but upon the influences that it exerts upon the adults of the community who are not considered to be its pupils in any formal sense.

The recognition that the village school could be a potent factor for social change within the community is not of course new to the history of educational policy in Rhodesia. Attempts to harness and direct this potential can be traced back

as far as the work of men like Keigwin and Jowitt, whose efforts have been described by Franklyn Parker.² Keigwin, a Native Commissioner in the period after the first World War, was intent on developing African village industries throughout the Reserves. His concern was basically economic: "The resources of the country would be better used. Africans would learn better work habits. Their earning power would increase. Model villages would spring up."³ In this scheme the local village schools would serve as bases for demonstrators, who would be trained at government schools set up for this purpose. Although many of Keigwin's ambitions were not realised, his plans did lead to the establishment of the Domboshawa and Tjolotjo Training Centres in 1920 and 1921 and to an increased awareness that village education involved not only the classroom but the community, an awareness reflected in the Report of the Colonial Office Advisory Board on African Education, published in 1925. This report gave a definition of the aims of education closely related to those of contemporary concepts in community development and drew attention to the role of education in the development of local political leadership: "Education should be adapted to the mentality, aptitudes, occupations and traditions of the various peoples, conserving as far as possible all sound and healthy elements in the fabric of their social life . . . Its aims should be

to render the individual more efficient in his or her condition of life . . . [and it] must include the raising up of capable, trustworthy, public-spirited leaders of the people . . ."⁴

This inclusive approach to the aims of education, with its constant reference to environment, found a champion in J. H. Jowitt, Director of Native Development in the early 1930s. Jowitt's responsibilities included education, agriculture, industrial training, and community welfare. Under Jowitt's plan the village schools were to become centres for various types of adult education in agriculture, home economics and health science, as well as being academic centres for both young and old. To implement this programme Jowitt counted heavily upon the Jeannes Teachers Scheme, a programme first developed in the American South for training and utilizing teachers in various phases of community leadership. The Phelps-Stokes Commission of 1925 recommended such a programme for Southern Rhodesia and, financed by the Carnegie Corporation, the Jeannes Teacher Programme played an important role in African education in this country during the early 1930s.

It is not within the scope of this article to discuss the reasons for the decline in this emphasis upon the village school as the nucleus of community development schemes in official circles after Jowitt's resignation in 1934, an emphasis only recently revived by various Government commissions, reports and statements of policy.⁵ What this paper does attempt to do is to support the hypothesis that the objective of Jowitt and the Colonial Office Report of 1925, the "raising up of capable, trustworthy, public-spirited leaders of the people", obtained a degree of realisation through the creation and establishment of the village schools which proliferated in this country after Jowitt's departure. This development was a largely unintentional by-product of the establishment of these schools and was to develop, not in the classroom through the instruction of a teacher, but under the council tree in the school yard, where the parents of the children met by themselves or with the head teacher to define the goals and solve the problems that the presence of the school had brought to their community.

More specifically, this article seeks to demonstrate that:

1. The establishment of the village school has had a profound effect upon the structure of community leadership in tribal trust lands.
2. This effect can generally be defined in terms of one of the accepted goals of community

development: ". . . change from [a] condition where one or two people or a small elite within or without [a] local community make decision[s] for the rest of the people to a condition where people *themselves* make their decisions about matters of common concern . . . from a condition where few participate to one where many participate."⁶

3. The village school in Rhodesia's plural society has functioned as a "broker institution" not only for its pupils but also for the adults of the community involved in its supervision. This is likewise a function which parallels another goal of community development: "... to assist people to acquire the attitudes, knowledge, skills and resources required to solve, through communal self-help and organisation, as wide a range of *local* problems as possible . . ."⁷

In the concluding section of the article, comment will be made on the discrepancy between these conclusions and those of certain official and semi-official government statements regarding the place of the village school in community development.

TRADITIONAL LEADERSHIP

Some sixty miles north-east of Salisbury the Mazoe river is joined by the Nyagui and enters a long narrow valley formed by two parallel ranges which run from the south-west to the north-east. After running for twelve miles along this valley, it takes a ninety degree turn and cuts dramatically through the northerly of the two ranges, to flow into more broken country to the north-west. The valley that it has left continues to the north-east, drained by a small stream which enters the Mazoe where it turns, and which forms the boundary between the Uzumba and Maramba Tribal Trust lands.

In its break to the north-west the Mazoe pushes its way over a giant doleritic dyke which acts as a natural dam and which has created a large pool. The home of a dozen hippos, the pool is known as Chizinga.⁸ The area within five miles of this pool on the eastern bank of the river is the geographical unit which is referred to in this article as the Chizinga community. In 1957 this area was inhabited by four headmen and their people, all of them living in the Maramba sector. In the history of the development of this area into what is now called the Chizinga community the story of the establishment of Chizinga school plays a prominent part. It is a story which in its early stages is closely linked to two men. One of these was Hoko, who in 1957 was the headman of Madziwa village. Hoko had worked for many years in town, had

recognised the value of schooling and had given his children a lower primary education at the nearest village school seven miles away. He had later sent two of his children on for upper primary schooling at the Nyadiri Methodist Mission. Through this contact he became acquainted with several missionaries and his wife became a member of the Methodist church.

Retiring from his work in 1956 Hoko returned home and was offered the leadership of this village in the absence of Madziwa himself. One of his first acts as the new headman was to seek the establishment of a school in the area. His first formal discussions on the subject were with his fellow headmen Danda, Humbe and Mutowa and agreement was soon reached on this subject.

In his first task Hoko was encouraged by the second man who figures prominently in this part of the story, Mack Karidza. Karidza, a MuBudjga from Mtoko, had moved to Uzumba about 1930 as a boy and settled with his parents at Katsuro, about seven miles from Chizinga. He passed Standard IV at the local school, became a member and later a steward in the Methodist church. Acting as an itinerant lay evangelist he reached Chizinga in 1956 and began holding services in the area, attended by many of the people in Madziwa village including headman Hoko and his family. Early in 1957 Karidza applied to the Land Development Officer for a new field allotment. The eventual result was that Karidza was constituted a headman and granted an area at Chizinga on the Uzumba side. In September 1957 Karidza, thirteen other men, and their families moved into the valley and started clearing land for their fields. An important new settlement had come to the community.

Karidza and Hoko each tell slightly different but nevertheless complementary stories regarding these first steps towards the formation of a school at Chizinga. According to Hoko, encouraged by Karidza he approached the African Methodist minister stationed in Maramba in early 1957 and together they walked over the area searching for a suitable site for a school. Failing to find one in Maramba they conceived the idea of crossing the boundary stream and establishing a school on the Uzumba side, where plenty of level ground near water was available.

Hoko put this plan to the district commissioner during a chance meeting with him at Maramba. When the district commissioner expressed doubt as to the feasibility of a school being established in the territory of one chief for the benefit of children living in the territory of another, Hoko

assured him that Chief Nyajina of Uzumba would have no objection since he (Hoko) was related to him. A meeting later between Hoko, the district commissioner and the chief confirmed Nyajina's willingness for the school to be built, and according to Hoko, the district commissioner was left to negotiate with education authorities in Salisbury concerning the establishment of the school. Hoko returned to Chizinga and met with the headmen, Humbe, Mutowa, and Nyahono. They agreed together to make bricks for the school and the first kiln was made and burned by their people in September. A second kiln of bricks was later formed and burned by Karidza and his people.

Karidza's version of this story is substantially the same, although told from a perspective which gives his part more prominence. According to him, he gave Hoko and other headmen the idea of working for a school. He confirms Hoko's story of negotiations with the district commissioner and the chief, but gives equal prominence to the fact that it was he who, soon after his arrival at Chizinga in 1957, went as a representative of the community to apply to the school manager at Nyadiri for a school. For Hoko the main link between the community and the education department was the district commissioner, for Karidza it was the school manager.⁹

Whatever the interpretation placed on the different roles of Hoko and Karidza there is no question but that by the end of 1957 Karidza, the new headman, was the leader of the movement to gain a school for the valley. When the school manager visited the site in early 1958 it was Karidza who acted as host and spokesman, and who subsequently acted as the liaison between him and the parents. There appeared to be little rivalry between Hoko and Karidza. Hoko was a much older man who felt that he had achieved his main objective and seemed happy to follow the initiative of Karidza. Karidza for his part relied upon Hoko to mobilize support for the school programme, particularly among the Maramba headmen.

This then was the situation at the beginning of 1958. Two men, one a native of the area and the other a relative newcomer, but both with careers which had given them an appreciation of the value of formal education, had awakened the leaders of the Chizinga community to their need of a school. Both had utilized their contacts — Hoko with the chief and district commissioner and Karidza with the church and school manager — to communicate this need of the community to the larger society

and the agencies charged with the responsibility for education. They had come to a common agreement with their fellow headmen regarding the siting of the school and had acted together with them in getting their people to burn two kilns of bricks for the school building.

Up to this point our case history can be interpreted in terms of the response of traditional leadership to a new community objective.¹⁰ While the objective itself was basically an intrusive one, stemming from social changes in the larger fabric of society, the response to it was channelled initially along traditional lines of authority. Community action was focused and directed by the traditional leadership. In those early brick-making days it was as villages directed by their headmen that the people worked. In all the decisions that were made it was the headmen who were the recognised, undisputed leaders. They, of course, consulted their people through countless informal discussions, but the meetings that were held to discuss the siting of the school, that made the decisions to apply to the chief and the school manager or to form bricks — these meetings were meetings of headmen, not general meetings of the community. And within this decision-making group it was Karidza, and to a lesser extent Hoko, who gave real direction. One is reminded of a phrase from a passage already quoted, "A condition where one or two people or a small elite . . . make decisions for the rest of the people."

NEW ALIGNMENTS

Such a condition could not last. Customary patterns of Shona tribal authority cannot indefinitely cope with the changes that Western patterns of education, economics and religion are now introducing into the tribal trust lands. The inadequacy of the traditional patterns of authority in Chizinga community began to make itself felt in 1958. The two kilns of brick were not sufficient to build the buildings that the manager said were needed. More would have to be burned. Money would have to be collected to purchase window frames, corrugated iron and other building supplies. Competent builders would have to be hired. The meeting of headmen, each of whom represented independent units acting in co-operation, was not capable of meeting these challenges. For one thing, not all the headmen were taking the project as seriously as some of their people. Many times when the headmen would gather to discuss the progress of the school some of them would be absent, particularly Mutowa and Nyahono. Furthermore, even those headmen who were initially interested in the scheme found that they

could not deliver their quota of bricks — the traditional sanctions at their disposal were not adequate to force their people to produce the required work. And as for the collection and keeping of school money, who was to do that? The fact was that the establishment of a school at Chizinga was already demanding a new type of social grouping within the community.

Not all the adults of the community were equally motivated towards the establishment of the school. Those who were the parents of school or pre-school age children were the most strongly motivated. They were, therefore, the most responsive to pressures which could be brought to bear to induce them to undertake the responsibilities necessary for its establishment. It must not be thought that this group was a small one. It comprised most of the adults in the community between the ages of 20 and 50. What is important is that the interests of this group could not be adequately channelled through a traditional system of influence and authority dominated (because of its emphasis upon seniority) by a generation slightly senior to it. This new group cut across the boundaries of village organisation within the valley; a new alignment was required to direct its activities and enforce the demands of its objectives.

A school committee was therefore called for. The initiative for its formation came from Karidza, who had been familiar with school committees elsewhere. The school committee was to negotiate with the education authorities, to determine work quotas at the school for the parents, to tax the parents for the funds necessary to carry out the construction programme and to hold funds thus collected.

A general meeting of all parents wishing to co-operate in the projects was called and met at the school site. Sixty families enrolled their names as charter members in the project. (This was out of a total of approximately eighty-five households in the valley at the time). Those who were enrolled were guaranteed a place for their children when the school opened. In return they were required to pay building fees of \$4 per family, and to contribute labour and bricks as the school committee required. Enrolled parents who failed to turn up for work as required were to be fined 25c. per day. Those parents in the community who refused to be enrolled and undertake the responsibility of building the school would have their children accepted in school only after children of enrolled parents had been accommodated and after they had paid an enrolment fee: \$15 for

parents who lived in distant villages, \$19 for parents who lived near the school.¹¹

Thus did the general parents meeting of 1958 at Chizinga create a new organisation to achieve its objectives. The innovation was sweeping and profound. But when it came to a selection of a school committee to act as its administrative organisation, the parents' meeting was conservative. A new framework for co-ordinating the objectives and activities of the group had been devised, but the parents had not yet learned how to make it efficient and representative. The committee was constituted with three members. Two were leaders whom the parents already knew and trusted — the headmen Karidza (chairman) and Hoko (treasurer). The third member, James Chitumbe, a young man from Karidza's village, was elected because he possessed a skill which could not be found in the ranks of the headmen — he could read and write well.

Karidza thus not only retained his leadership but also extended his authority in a way not possible before. His influence over members of the community in villages other than his own was increased. He now controlled school finance, for Hoko's treasurership involved nothing more than collecting money and then turning it over to Karidza. Karidza evidently had some idea of committee work and public stewardship, for in 1958 he purchased a hard-backed foolscap notebook for committee records. He did not, however, implement this action, for no entries were made in the notebook until 1963, the year Karidza gave up his chairmanship.

During 1959 and 1960 the school committee remained the same. In 1960 the community was informed by the manager that approval had been granted by the Education Department to start school in 1961. This news revived the flagging enthusiasm of the parents, and a three classroom building and teachers' residence were completed by the end of the year.

Comment should be made on the part played by the church in the development of Chizinga school. As has been mentioned, Karidza was a Methodist lay preacher, and by 1960 regular services were being held on the school site. The manager was a missionary from the Nyadiri Methodist Mission, and it was accepted by the parents of the community that theirs was to be a Methodist school. In the eyes of the government, the Methodist church was the "responsible body". Yet in spite of these formal ties with the community the influence of the church was loose and indirect. The manager's influence on the com-

munity tended to be channelled along two lines: (a) the recognition by the community of the fact that he could delay the opening of the school until adequate accommodation had been provided, and (b) his power to appoint teachers to the school whom he felt would guide it in the right direction. Apart from negotiating the occasional purchase of building material he did not handle school committee funds, nor did he regulate the selection of school committee members.¹² Quite possibly the presence of the church in the community influenced the attitudes and objectives of its members in many ways, but this influence was diffuse and mediated. Responsibility and initiative for the development of the school remained largely with local leadership.

In January 1961 school started with three teachers. The annual parents' meeting, convening in the same month, added the newly appointed headteacher to the committee, otherwise its membership remained the same. However, currents of dissatisfaction with the old leadership, temporarily suppressed during the elation over the start of the school in 1961, began to make themselves felt. A new headteacher, Musasa, who had taken over from his predecessor in August, 1961, was quick to sense and concur with this dissatisfaction. Karidza had become increasingly autocratic and there was some suspicion that he had mishandled school funds. In an attempt to make the school committee more representative, Musasa proposed that its membership be enlarged, a suggestion which met with quick approval from the parents' meeting in January 1962. Two more members were added to the committee, one a young man from Karidza's village, and one a man locally regarded as the vice-headman of Humbe village. Old Hoko was dropped from membership and was replaced by a younger man. This was, I think, a genuine case of retirement. Hoko was feeling his age and had been replaced by a younger son of Madziwa as headman earlier that year. But Karidza was retained for another year; the community was not ready to discard the leader who had provided much of the original incentive to start the school.

One trend becomes obvious when we examine the 1962 committee; the representation of traditional leadership has dropped sharply. Through 1961 headmen dominated the committee, in 1962 there was only one headman in the committee of six. After this date the fact that a man was a headman was never a critical factor in his election to the school committee. Headmanship could assist a man's candidacy in that it gave him a chance to

be well known and to demonstrate his leadership ability, but was not itself a determining factor. The process of "change from a condition where . . . a small elite within . . . a local community make decisions for the rest of the people to a condition where people *themselves* make these decisions about matters of common concern" was well advanced.

It made an even greater advance the following year when the parents' meeting elected a new chairman in the place of Mack Karidza. Karidza had become increasingly domineering, blocking any projects of the headteacher's that did not meet with his approval. There is some indication that the architects of the vote to oust him from the chairmanship were the headteacher, Mususa, and the secretary, although there was no open hostility between them. Reflecting on the meeting, the headteacher says, "There was no fighting, but the speeches were hard." As a result Karidza was replaced by Gurure as chairman. Karidza was retained on the committee as a gesture of reconciliation, but he found his demotion hard to take. "He did not come to committee meetings," said one informant, "because he was angry." Of Karidza's replacement, Gurure, informants said: "He was not very strong, but his committee was very strong."

The significance of the 1963 general meeting for the history of the Chizinga community cannot be over-emphasized. The school had been started largely through the initiative and efforts of a few men, particularly Karidza. But by now it had assumed such an importance to the community that its members were unwilling to allow its progress to be dictated or frustrated by one individual regardless of his prestige. The mechanism was available to the parents through the annual election to dispense with any leader whose work appeared inadequate, and in 1963 they reached the stage where they were willing to use it. It is perfectly clear from discussions with members of the community that Karidza was not evicted from office for any particular personal animosity against him; rather action was taken because of a general conviction that it was for the good of the school.

One important result of this action was that it served as a dramatic reminder to the members of the Chizinga committee of the representative character of their work. They could not act independently or autocratically without endangering their positions on the committee. Traditional Shona culture has of course its own sanctions against autocracy, idiosyncrasy and action for

personal gain by those in authority, but they are not as precipitate or categorical as an election and the sudden loss of office. With the successful utilization of this technique by the Chizinga parents the degree of responsiveness to public opinion by local leadership reached a new level. The community development ideal of "a condition where many participate . . . where people *themselves* make decisions about matters of common concern" had been approximated, at least in broad outline.

Another consequence of the 1963 general meeting was that politics—in the popular sense of an active pursuit of public support for candidacy to office—gained more prominence in the community. Membership in the school committee became highly desirable. This popularity can be seen, I believe, as a corollary of the increased awareness of the responsibility of the school committee to act as the servant of public opinion. If, through the mechanism of the annual election, membership on the committee reflected current public opinion, it obviously became an important index of high status. Membership on the school committee was, of course, not the only road to a high status in Chizinga but its achievement was relatively accessible, implied great popularity and could carry considerable power. These new attitudes towards school committee membership are reflected in the increasing changes in membership during 1965-67. The size of the committee was progressively increased, a number of new names appear and individuals frequently change their positions within the committee itself.

What were the prominent characteristics of those who were successful in winning election? Most appeared to be self-confident in their public pronouncements. In a community where school experience has not existed long enough for reputations to be built on the confidence of long experience, the people turned to those who had confidence in themselves. Of some it was said, "They were people who were outspoken," and of others, "They were prominent in their talking." On the other hand, occasionally a different personality is found, such as Gurure of whom it was said, "He is a neutral man, who cannot make enemies." More objective criteria appear to have been used in the selection of those whose offices required specialised skills. Regarding the choice of the treasurer one informant commented, "When we think of a treasurer, we always look at a man's home, the way he manages to keep things."

The success of the school committee was judged on the basis of the absence of any scandal of mis-

management (particularly with regard to funds) and concrete achievement — the building of an additional classroom or the acquisition of an additional teacher. A frequent gambit of those campaigning for office, either ostensibly or unobtrusively, was to suggest that, had they been on the committee, two classrooms rather than one would have been built, etc.

Two rivals in this political game were the brothers Willie and James Karidza, sons of a brother of Mack. Willie was elected to the committee in 1964. In 1965 he rose to the position of vice-chairman of the committee. He was bitterly opposed by his younger brother James, who successfully conducted a campaign to replace him and who became vice-chairman in 1966. But James could not live up to his promises, 1966 was a minor disaster and he and other committee members came under suspicions of misappropriation of funds. The chairman, Chirwa, resigned and in 1967 an enlarged and almost completely new committee was elected, with Willie back in its membership, this time as chairman. It was this committee that was directing the school, apparently efficiently, at the time field work ceased.

NEW TECHNIQUES

Enough has been said to demonstrate how the Chizinga evidence corroborates the proposition that the establishment of a village school tends to have wide repercussions on the structure of community leadership. The introduction of such an institution accelerates the creation of new social groupings, the acceptance of different aspirations and expectations, and the introduction of new techniques for the achievement of community and individual goals. This leads us to the third proposition of this article, which is that, having introduced these changes, the school acts as an agent in training individuals for this change, that it acts as "broker institution" not only for its pupils but for the adults of the community as well.

The concept of the "broker institution" has been developed in response to the need for a conceptual framework with which to understand the institutional processes whereby individuals in a plural society move from one section of it to the other.¹³ In such a society the "broker" — whether an individual or an institution — has links with both sections and thus mediates between the one and the other. Rhodesia with its distinct cultural groups, where the super-ordinate minority group possesses a culture towards which the majority subordinate group moves as it begins to practise new institutional forms and accepts substantial changes in value orientation, qualifies as a plural

society in the sense that Smith and others have used the term.¹⁴ In such a situation the school, shaped as it is by the cultural values and techniques of the superordinate group, obviously becomes an important broker, imparting these values and techniques to its students and thus equipping them for the new roles which have been introduced. Frequently this function of the school is seen in occupational socialization. As Joseph Farrell has pointed out, the school may provide skills that are saleable such as carpentry and accountancy, but more often provides the necessary tool skills such as reading, writing, general knowledge and — most important in Rhodesia — the certification which open up a wide class of occupations to the student.¹⁵ This role of the school in the tribal trust areas has been acknowledged and accepted; what has not been so readily recognised is that the school has likewise acted as an agent of occupational socialization for the adults of the community involved in its supervision as well. The Chizinga material offers ample evidence of this fact. Perhaps the most explicit documentation of this process is to be found in the school record book started in 1963. Here can be found a sometimes humorous, sometimes poignant, but always illuminating record of struggle and co-operation as the school committee members sought to learn the lessons and acquire the skills that their new roles demand of them. The agenda of their meeting on February 20, 1964, gives a good idea on the scope of the problems they faced. The Shona is so succinct and colourful that I give it here together with a rather free translation:

1. *Kuwanika kwe mari* — where are we going to get the money to meet our budget?
2. *Kusevenzeswa kwe vana ne mateacher* — The use being made of student labour by the teachers.
3. *Vabereki havari kuuya kubasa* — Parents are not coming to work as they should.
4. *Mateachers ari kurova vana* — Teachers are beating our children.
5. *Mateachers ari kunyenga* — Teachers are making eyes at the school girls.
6. *Vabereki varikudura* — Parents are overcharging [the teachers for ploughing].
7. *Masabuku arikunyima minda* — Headman are not giving the teachers sufficient lands to plough.
8. *Varongereri vari kutiza nemari* — Foster parents are running off with the fees left for their charges by parents.¹⁶
9. *Vabereki vasina kupedza mari* — What to

do with parents who have not completed their payments of building fees.

10. *Kuna manager kune mari yedu ya '62 \$18.*— The manager has got \$18 of our money going back to 1962.
11. *Vanhu vasina mari tivape 2 months* — Proposed that parents without money be given two months to pay up.

Placed in academic jargon, these items might be listed differently. Many of them represent problems of relationship. Here we find items concerning student-teacher relations and teacher-parent relations, problems produced by the occupational socialization introduced to the community by the establishment of the school. Here we find also the problem of parent-child relationship represented in the item on parental irresponsibility, a problem which doubtless existed in Chizinga before the coming of the school, but which has now acquired new dimensions. Extra-community relations are also represented in the items on the agenda concerning the school manager and elsewhere in the record book in items regarding the sub-chief.

But if problems of relationship form one important focus of attention, the effective mobilization and utilization of community resources for the benefit of the school constitutes another. Elsewhere in the record book are to be found items regarding the planning and letting of contracts for school buildings, the purchase of building material and the maintenance of school grounds, buildings and equipment. In all of this finance looms large and much of the record book is a diary of the committee's efforts to find an effective means for the self-taxation necessary to provide funds and adequate techniques for handling and utilizing these funds once acquired.

This is perhaps the point at which to indicate the fees for which parents find themselves responsible at Chizinga. There is, first of all, the "school fee". This fee ranges from 35c. for children in grade I to 60c. for children in grade V. It is collected annually by the headteacher and is forwarded to the school manager, who uses it for the purchase of school equipment, supervision travel beyond that covered by government grant and office expenses. There is a sports fee of 25c. per annum per child, collected by the headteacher and kept by the school committee treasurer for the purchase of sports equipment and payment of expenses in connection with school sporting events. Parents are responsible for the purchase of their children's textbooks and stationery; these expenses can range from 60c. for children in grade I to \$4 for children in grade IV. Finally there is the build-

ing fee, determined annually by the school committee according to the scope of its building programme, but usually working out at about \$4 per year.¹⁷

The committee is thus directly responsible for the management of the sports fund and the building fund, the latter being an especially heavy responsibility. First of all there is the problem of assessment, since the amount is open to review each year. The school committee must plan a building programme, set a budget for it and then determine what the individual assessment is to be. Since parents are not all in the same position their assessment may vary. The fact that parents who have failed to participate in the building programme in previous years may be liable to a fine has already been mentioned. Notes in the committee minutes indicate other decisions along this line: "Those who have gone off to work to pay 50c. per month." "Those children who have no parents may study without payment of the building fee."

Beyond the problems of assessment the committee is faced with the difficulties of collection. The record book is full of brief notations which indicate the struggle involved. Against the blank indicating one man's failure to pay his assessment a treasurer has written "I wrote him twice". Elsewhere can be found signed statements, such as that of James Kagoro, "I promise to bring £1.6.8d.", indications of diligent pressure by the treasurer. The committee's main difficulty in this regard is the lack of an adequate range of sanctions to bring against delinquents. The committee has no customary or statutory means of enforcing such people to pay their fees. It does have the authority to bar any child from school whose parents have not met their obligations — a threat that many village schools use to enforce payment. But this raises questions regarding the committee's responsibility towards children of irresponsible parents in the community. This issue was the focus for much discussion and reflection at Chizinga for many years. A terse minute recording of the committee's decision: "*Kutanda vana kwarambwa*" — "It was decided not to bar children from school [for non-payment of fees]" — reflects a growing sense of community responsibility and foresight for which the African villager is often not credited. The abjuration of such a powerful sanction has meant, inevitably, more difficulty for the school committee in its work of collection.

Finally the school record reveals a detailed history of the struggle to achieve the proper

stewardship of school funds. Dark tales of embezzlement can be found: "We discussed the matter of the shortage in the books. The meeting decided that [X] was responsible for this shortage . . . the matter must be pursued further." Other items are more humorous than serious. In one report, after listing among his receipts items for which he had "lost the papers" it was discovered that the treasurer had more money in hand than he was supposed to. The committee met this unusual situation with a quick response: "*Dare rinoti hazvina mhosya ne over iyoyi*" — "Never mind the surplus, keep it in the treasury anyway!" A review of the years 1963-1967 reveals a vast improvement in the clarity of the financial record. Duplicate receipt books are now kept, and annual audits of the treasurer's records are made by the committee. The present treasurer keeps a running balance calculated after each transaction: a tedious and clumsy procedure but one which makes the financial situation patently clear. It is part of a record of progress revealed in the committee minutes, a record of the training of committee members in the new techniques of the superordinate culture. With its links with both sub-cultures of the society, the school is acting as a broker for these adults of Chizinga, training them for the new roles that are now intruding into rural Shona society. The value of this training is recognised by the inhabitants of the tribal trust lands in other contexts; it is not without significance, for instance, that in 1967 all nine members of the Uzumba Council were, or had been, members of some local school committee.

DISCUSSION

This article has set out to support the hypothesis that introduction of the village school has had a profound effect upon the structure of community leadership in tribal trust lands, that it has assisted the adults of these communities to acquire the new attitudes and skills required by a changing social situation, and that these changes can be defined in terms of the stated goals of community development. This process has, in fact, taken place at Chizinga. It has taken place largely through local initiative and direction. Neither mission nor government can claim much credit for this development; its history must be understood not as the result of deliberate planning but as the product of community response to the introduction of a new institution. Yet in spite of, or perhaps because of, this lack of outside direction and interference, the development has taken place.

These conclusions stand in contradiction to a position taken, either directly or implicitly, by

several official or semi-official statements concerning community participation in the management of African village schools. While recognising the potential of the village school for a programme of community development, these statements imply that the establishment of village schools has heretofore largely been a matter of mission initiative and their management and development largely a matter of mission direction under the guidance of the Education Department. The suggestion is also made that to properly involve local committees in the management of their schools it will be necessary to remove them from mission control and place them under local government bodies now being set up by government. Speaking in Parliament on August 18, 1967, the Minister of Education announced restrictions on the future opening of village schools by the missions "to ensure that the expansion of the primary school system shall depend upon the efforts of local initiative and shall come under local control."¹⁸ The editor of *The Rhodesian Community Development Review*, published by a government agency, has spoken of the "increasing pressure on the part of local people for a say in how their contributions, in the form of school fees and contributions to school building funds, are utilised. These contributions have, for the most part, been paid over to missions, to be used in trust for school purposes."¹⁹ Writing in the same issue the Deputy Secretary for African Education in the Ministry of Education cites both the Judges and Mangwende Commissions as indicating that "local communities have little to say in the schools, often built by their own hands, and little opportunity to 'acquire the attitude, knowledge, skills and resources required to solve, through communal help and organisation, their local problems'."²⁰

Obviously these statements gain no support from the Chizinga materials. How are we to explain the contradiction? One suggestion might be that Chizinga is atypical, not representing a condition generally pertaining in rural African communities. In certain respects this is the case; it is a community which crosses tribal boundaries and which lacks a township, a feature of most tribal trust communities. These are, however, matters pertaining more to the question of the definition of "community", a question not dealt with in this article, than to our subject. More germane is the fact that material from other schools in Uzumba would seem to indicate that some have not passed beyond the stage of domination by one or two strong individuals as has Chizinga. It is also true that some denominations have had a policy of

collecting the building fees, building the school buildings themselves and in other ways exercising closer control over the community aspects of school development. The author is not equipped to state just how widespread such policies are; what can be asserted is that the pattern of mission involvement, or lack of it, here described for Chizinga is by far the most common pattern for village schools in the Mrewa and Mtoko districts. In its broad outline Chizinga must be considered representative of a predominant type of school community for these two districts, and the materials presented here are therefore of broad general significance.

Perhaps a more significant reason for the discrepancy is to be found in the difference in research methodology involved. The statements quoted above are based on commission reports, commissions which relied heavily on the "taking of evidence", written and oral, at various hearings. This is, of course, a reliable and respected technique of gaining information under certain circumstances, a technique often incorporated in the interview and questionnaire methods of social research. It is especially effective in ascertaining opinion on specific subjects, less effective for investigating social process. Had this technique been the sole method used at Chizinga, certain issues would doubtless have come to light — complaints about the manager or sub-chief holding funds, pride over certain accomplishments, criticism concerning certain arrangements. The current opinion of the community would have been revealed, but it is doubtful whether such a technique would likewise have revealed the processes of change in organisation, values and behaviour which have taken place in the valley.

Another weakness of the investigative technique which relies heavily upon evidence presented within a formal contest is that the opinion sample is likely to be biased in favour of one or more groups within the social universe being studied. In certain circumstances the informants may be self-selected: the articulate, the outspoken, the dissident. In others the nature of the investigation may restrict the range of informants to certain categories; the literate, the enfranchised, the

incumbents of positions of power and prestige.

While fully recognizing the value of the formal interview, social anthropology attempts to minimize the dangers just mentioned by incorporating certain safeguards into its techniques. Sampling bias is controlled by adherence to the randomization principle in selection, and observed behaviour is made an important factor in the evaluation of verbal data. The cautious anthropologist will not claim that subjective bias is completely eliminated from his investigation, but he will expect this factor to be greatly reduced by this approach. Finally, the anthropologist attempts to gain a clearer insight into social processes through an investigation which has significant time-depth, a technique sometimes referred to as the "extended case method". This may involve a replication study of the same community made at two separate points in time;²¹ more ideally it would consist of a properly diachronic study carried out more or less continually over a considerable, and structurally significant, period.

As was stated in the introduction, the data which forms the basis for this article were obtained at irregular intervals over a period of ten years, and therefore this study falls somewhere between the two types just mentioned. In some ways this is a rather tedious process, and frustrating, for those who demand immediate results. Nevertheless the findings presented here suggest that it is a valuable supplement to the more conventional procedures of governmental investigation, and should be utilized by those responsible for the formation of administrative policy in the rural areas. When this is done it will be found that a form of community co-operation and initiative closely conforming to the objectives of community development has existed in the tribal trust areas of Rhodesia for many years, embodied in local school committees. Those responsible for directing the Government's programme of community development who ignore this fact, and who fail to effectively articulate the power and experience of these local school committees into the larger units of local government now being created will do so to the detriment of the programme they are pledged to promote.

REFERENCES

1. Material used in this article has been selected from the data of an anthropological field work exercise carried out at irregular intervals over a period of ten years, from 1958 to 1967. Since the period of investigation covers such a wide time span, the material yields a diachronic perspective especially valuable for the analysis of social processes attempted here.
2. PARKER, F. 1962 Community Development and Education in Southern Rhodesia, 1920-1935. *Int. Rev. Missions*, 51, 335-347.
3. KEIGWIN, H. S. 1921 An Educational Experiment. *S. Afr. J. Sc.*, 18, 172-182.

4. GREAT BRITAIN 1925 *Education Policy in British Tropical Africa*. London, H.M.S.O. Cmd. 2374, p. 4, quoted in PARKER, 342.
5. SOUTHERN RHODESIA 1961 *Report of the Mangwende Reserve Commission of Inquiry*.
1962 *Report of the Southern Rhodesia Education Commission* [Judges' Report].
RHODESIA 1965 *Local Government and Community Development: The Role of Ministries and Co-ordination. Statement of Policy and Directive by the Prime Minister*. Salisbury, Government Printer.
6. SANDERS, I. T. 1958 *The Community: An Introduction to a Social System*. New York, The Ronald Press, p. 407.
7. RHODESIA 1965 *Local Government and Community Development*, p. 2.
8. This and the names used for the main *dramatis personae* of this account are pseudonymous.
9. Standard procedure for establishing a school in 1957 was for parents to contact the school manager of the mission of their choice. The manager, having determined that the consent of the chief had been granted, would then submit an official application to the District Commissioner. This official would satisfy himself that the application was in order — that the siting did not contravene the three-mile rule and that the parents wished for this particular church to supervise their school, etc. He would then forward the application to the Department of Education. Applications had to be submitted at least one year before the proposed opening of the school and had to take their turn in a priority listing.
10. It can, of course, also be interpreted in terms of a search for power on the part of status incumbents: see LEACH, E. 1964 *Political Systems of Highland Burma*. London, G. Bell & Sons, p. 10. Such an analysis is, however, outside the scope of this article.
11. It should be noted that twelve of the original sixty enrolled families withdrew in 1958 because "the work was too hard".
12. During the 1950s the Methodist church had a regulation requiring school committees of Methodist-related schools to be made up of twelve members, six of whom were to be Methodists, including the chairman. This regulation was in fact rarely invoked, and was certainly never considered at Chizinga.
13. The term "broker institution" was apparently first used in WOLFE, E. R. 1956 *Aspects of Group Relations in a Complex Society: Mexico*. *Am. Anthropol.*, 58, 1065-1078. More recently the term has been used by educationalists; see for example, in: ADAMS, D. and FARRELL, J. P. eds. 1960 *Education and Social Development*. Syracuse, N.Y., Center for Development Education.
14. SMITH, M. G. 1965 *The Plural Society in the British West Indies*. Berkeley, University of California Press. See also FURNIVALL, J. S. 1948 *Colonial Policy and Practice*. London, Cambridge University Press, pp. 303-312.
15. FARRELL, J. P. 1967 *Education and Pluralism in Selected Caribbean Societies*. *Comp. Educ. Rev.*, 11, 165-166.
16. The reference to *varongeris*, foster parents, indicates that some people of the community were boarding students, probably children of relatives living in areas without a school.
17. Figures as for 1967.
18. RHODESIA 1967 *Debates of the Legislative Assembly*. Salisbury, Government Printer, 68, col. 1188.
19. EDITORIAL 1967 *Rhod. Community Dev. Rev.*, 2, 1.
20. STEWART, D. 1967 *The Role of Education in the National Policy of Community Development*. *Rhod. Community Dev. Rev.*, 2, 4.
21. For a Rhodesian example of a replication study, see: GARBETT, G. K. 1960 *Growth and Change in a Shona Ward*. Salisbury, University College of Rhodesia, Department of African Studies, Occasional Paper No. 1.



This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons
Attribution – NonCommercial - NoDerivs 3.0 License.

To view a copy of the license please see:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

This is a download from the BLDS Digital Library on OpenDocs
<http://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/>